

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed June 3, 2003, in which Claims 1 through 8 were rejected. Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the reference cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the amendments made herein, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

The specification and Claims 1 through 8 are amended herein. No claims are cancelled. New Claims 9 through 14 are added for consideration at this time. Accordingly, Claims remain pending.

All the changes are made for clarification and are based on the application and drawings as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

With respect to Paragraph 1, the Examiner objected to certain informalities in Claim 1. Applicants have amended Claim 1 herein for clarification. In addition, Applicants have made the same amendments to

independent Claim 8 for the same reason.

It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added by these changes.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. SECTION 102(b)

With respect to Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 8 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,283,453 to Siefried *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as "Seifried *et al.*").

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In general, the present invention relates to the use of a bopp film used in the production of ceramic capacitors. According to the claimed process, the film is coated with a ceramic coating on a smooth surface of the bopp. The coating is dried and is subsequently separated. According to this configuration of the ceramic capacitors, the dielectric medium is the ceramic layer which has been separated from the bopp layer (please refer to page 1, lines 5 through 15 of the application as filed). Applicants note that there is *no bopp film in the capacitor itself*.

In general, Seifried *et al.* relates to a biaxially stretched composite film which comprises a first layer of a first propylene polymer and a second layer of

a second propylene polymer having a composition which differs from the first propylene polymer. However, and conversely with respect to the invention as presently claimed, in the capacitors according to Seifried *et al.* the bop film as such is the insulating medium *and has no ceramic layer formed thereon*. In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that the patent to Seifried *et al.* is in no way related to a ceramic insulating layer and, most importantly, there is no application of a ceramic coating onto the bopp film.

The Examiner made several comparisons between the invention as claimed and the reference to Siefried *et al.* In general, however, Applicants note that this comparison fails due to the fact that a *metal* coating is applied to the capacitor film of Siefried *et al.* Conversely, and very differently, Applicants claim the use of a *ceramic* coating in the present invention. Thus it cannot be said that Siefried *et al.* anticipates the present invention.

A further difference between the invention as claimed and Siefried *et al.* is the fact that there is no separation of layers in that reference. Specifically, separation of layers is not taught, disclosed, nor suggested in the patent to Siefried *et al.* The invention of Siefried *et al.* is a two layered bopp film which is used in that manner as a capacitor film. One layer of the film is modified and the other layer is pure polypropylene (see, for example, col. 5, lines 27 through 31). Accordingly, the difference between the layers is the surface roughness, and it is the multilayer film that is used for making the capacitor.

This, of course, is very different from the process and the use claimed in the present application. According to the present invention as claimed, a bopp film having different surface roughness with a *ceramic* coating on the smooth side is coated. The coating is thereafter dried and then the ceramic layer is separated from the bop film support. The film is then thrown away and the resulting ceramic layer is used for making the capacitor.

In view of at least these distinctions it is clear that the reference to Siefried *et al.* cannot be said to anticipate the invention as claimed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS 9 THROUGH 14

Applicants submit herewith new Claims 9 through 14 which are based upon original Claims 2 through 7 respectively. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by the inclusion of these claims.

CITATION OF RELEVANT ART


With respect to Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner listed prior art that was made of record but was not relied upon. Applicants have reviewed the cited art but do not believe that these references challenge the patentability of the present invention.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending Claims 1 through 14 as currently presented are in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, the Examiner disagrees, please call the undersigned attorney at 202-624-3947 in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding *before* issuing another action. The undersigned attorney is confident that any issue which might remain can readily be worked out by telephone.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,


Thomas T. Moga
Registration No. 34,881
Attorney for Applicants

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC
1901 L Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-457-0160

Dated: **September 4, 2003**

TTM/hs